

## **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed February 29, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

#### **A. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 7, 11, 13, and 30**

Claims 1-4, 7, 11, 13, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Garfinkle* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,924,878) in view of *Motamed* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,356,359) and further in view of *Van Der Linden* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,072,059).

As indicated above, Applicant has amended claim 1 from which all other claims depend. In view of that amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are moot.

Turning to the merits of claim 1, Applicant notes that none of the applied references disclose or suggest a network-based imaging service storing a scaled-down version of a full-sized document in a personal imaging repository, and a “network-based printing service separate from the imaging service” “automatically identifying the personal imaging repository and automatically retrieving via a network the scaled-down version of the full-sized document from the personal imaging repository”. In the *Garfinkle* reference, the “image server 16” generates the scaled-down version and therefore does not “retrieve” anything via a network. In the *Motamed* reference, *Motamed* only indicates that scaled-down versions are received. No positive retrieval is performed.

## **B. Rejection of Claim 12**

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Garfinkle, Motamed, Van Der Linden*, as applied to claim 11, and further in view of *Matsubayashi* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,938,202). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As identified above, *Garfinkle, Motamed, Van Der Linden* do not teach aspects of Applicant's claims. In that *Matsubayashi* does not remedy the deficiencies of the *Garfinkle, Motamed, Van Der Linden* references, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is allowable over the *Garfinkle/Motamed/Van Der Linden/Matsubayashi* combination for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable over *Garfinkle/Motamed/Van Der Linden*.

## **II. Canceled Claims**

Claims 4-6 and 30 have been canceled from the application without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequently.


## **III. New Claims**

Claims 31-34 have been added into the application through this Response. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims describe an invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully requests that these claims be held to be allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Risley", is written over a horizontal line.

David R. Risley  
Registration No. 39,345